UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,536	03/29/2004	Michael A. Rothman	42P18574	5343

8791 7590 04/08/2008

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER	
MA, CALVIN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/813,536	ROTHMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CALVIN C. MA	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 February 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 March 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The applicant's amendment has been fully considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 12-14, 16, 18-25, 27, 29, 30-31, and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wooten (US Patent: 6,947,014) in view of Sato et al. (US Pub: 2002/0154070)

As to claim 1, Wooten teaches a system comprising:

a computing device (computer) including a plurality of ports (i.e. the ports connecting to eyewear 20, mouse, and power source) (see [0018] and [0023]);

a primary display device (i.e. the primary display of the computer) coupled to a first port of the computing device (see [0018]);

a human interface device (HID) (10) detachably coupled to a second port of the computing device (i.e. video connector 30 attachable to the computer) (see Fig. 1, [0023]); and

video privacy logic within the computing device (i.e. the complementary software and hardware necessary for enabling the auto blanking system that works on connection of eyewear 20 to the computer, where the auto blanking privacy logic is executed in the memory and CPU of the computer which allow the blanking of the main display), coupled to the first port and coupled to the second port to disable the primary display device and route video display data to the HID when the video privacy logic detects a user has coupled the HID to the second port (this function is understood as the blanking system functions by replacing the primary display with the eyewear display which reroute the display interface and display it privately) (see Fig. 1, [0018], [0019], and [0023]).

However, Wooten does not explicitly teach wherein detecting that the user has coupled the HID comprises detecting a product identification code of the HID. Sato teaches wherein detecting that the user has coupled the HID comprises detecting a product identification code of the HID (i.e. the ID code that is adhered to a game product or the like associated with broadcast contents) (see Sato Fig. 23, [0180], [0181]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have adopted the process of detecting the identification code of the HID of Sato for the overall privacy viewing system of Wooten in order to reduce the idle waiting time by allowing quicker authentication process for the user. (see Sato, [0181])

As to claims 12, 19 and 23, see discussion of claim 1 above, claims 12, 19 and 23 are analyzed to be broader in scope than claim 1 and is rejected for the same reason.

As for claim 2, Wooten teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the HID (10) is a privacy device (i.e. private eyewear-based display system) (see [0019]).

As for claims 3, Wooten teaches the system of claim 2, wherein the privacy device comprises: a head mounted display (10) (see [0019], [0020], [0021]).

As for claims 4 and 20, Wooten teaches the system of claim 3, wherein the head mounted display (10)is one of video glasses and video goggles (i.e. video signal is displayed by a miniature liquid crystal display) (see [0019]).

As for claim 5, Wooten teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the HID is coupled to the second video port via a wireless connection (see [0024]).

As for claims 13 and 24, Wooten teaches a method of claim 12, further comprising: enabling the HID (i.e. private eyewear display is engaged when it is

attached to the computer it is enabled to operate in place of the primary display) (see [0018]).

As for claims 14 and 25, Wooten teaches the method of claim 13, wherein enabling the HID comprises: sending a signal to a video driver of the computing device to start sending video display data to the HID (see [0019]).

As for claims 16, 22 and 27, Wooten teaches the method of claim 12, further comprising: enabling the primary display device when the privacy device is uncoupled from the port of the computing device (i.e. the operation of the. device already contain the method) (see [0018]).

As for claims 18 and 29, Wooten teach the method of claim 16, further comprising: monitoring whether the privacy device continues to be coupled to the port (i.e. the operation of the device already contain the method) (see [0018]).

As for claim 21, Wooten teaches the method of claim 19, further comprising: disabling a primary display of the computing device automatically when the HID is coupled to the port of the computing device (see [0018]).

As for claim 30, Wooten teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the second port is an intelligent interface capable of detecting the insertion of the HID into the second port and determining whether the HID is a privacy HID (i.e. since the port on the computer is able to enact the auto blanking functionality the moment the privacy device is plugged in, the port has intelligent interface that activate the software to be executed on the computer to blank the main display when the computer recognize that the privacy device is present on the port) (see Fig. 1, [0018], [0019]).

As for claim 31, Wooten teaches the method of claim 12, further comprising prompting the user with the primary display device (i.e. the prompting of the user consist of simply that without the privacy device plugging in the main display is functional and when the privacy device is plugged in the main display no long functions, thereby prompting the user that the privacy auto blanking system is applied) to inquire whether the HID is a privacy device and receiving form the user an indication that the user would like to operate in privacy mode (i.e. the user indicate to the system to operate in the privacy mode by keeping the privacy device in the port by first plugging it in and keep plugging it in) (see Fig.1, [0018], [0019]).

As for claim 34, Wooten teaches the machine readable medium of claim 29, having further instructions stored therein (i.e. since the privacy device in only

a peripheral device of the computer it must function with the cooperation of the computer which must run the necessary instruction to induce the auto blanking of the main display) which when executed cause a machine to perform a set of operations further comprising: Enabling the primary display device and disabling the HID device upon detecting that the privacy device has been uncoupled from the port (i.e. it is by design that the privacy device enable the auto blanking system to function when plugged into the computer port, this implies that when it is not plugged in there is no blanking of the main display. Since other wise the privacy device would be always on the system on the day in which the computer is manufactured. Therefore, when the privacy device is deactivated by unplugging it from the port of the computer then the main display is no longer blanked which is by definition the normal function of an automatic blanking system for the main computer display) (See Fig. 1, [0018], [0019]).

As to claim 35, Wooten teaches the system of claim 1, wherein disabling the primary display device comprising the logic initiating a signal to cause the primary display device to become disabled (i.e. since the privacy device in only a peripheral device of the computer it must function with the cooperation of the computer which must run the necessary instruction to induce the auto blanking of the main display which means that a electronic signal is applied to blank the main display thereby disabling it) (See Fig. 1, [0018], [0019]).

4. Claims 15, 17, 26, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wooten in view of Sato as applied in claims 1-5, 12-14, 16, 18-25, 27, 29, 30-31, and 34 and further in view of Eck and et al (U.S.P.G. Pub 2002/0045484).

As for claim 15, note the discussion of Wooten and Sato above, Wooten teaches the method of claim 12, wherein disabling the primary display device comprises: sending a signal to a video driver of the computing device to one of stop sending video display data to the primary display device, send blank screen data to the primary driver (i.e. the operations of the device already contain the method) (see [0018]) but does not teach send splash screen data to the primary driver such that the primary display device displays a splash screen. Eck teaches send splash screen data to the primary driver such that the primary display device displays a splash screen (see [0139]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the splash screen of Eck in addition in the primary display during the blanking period of Wooten and Sato so that a user can briefly view the primary information before viewing the detail of the content information, thereby enhancing the functionality of displaying information (see Eck [0139]).

As for claim 17, Wooten teaches the method of claim 16, wherein enabling the primary display device comprises: sending a signal to a video driver of the computing device to one of start sending video display data to the primary display device, stop sending blank screen data to the primary display device (i.e. the operations of the device already contain the method) (see [0018]). Eck teaches sending splash screen data to the primary display device (see [0139]).

Claim 26 is analyzed as previously disclosed with respect to claim 15 because it recites the same limitations.

Claim 28 is analyzed as previously disclosed with respect to claim 17 because it recite the same limitations.

5. Claims 6-11 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wooten in view of Sato as applied to claims1-5, 12-14, 16, 18-25, 27, 29, 30-31, and 34 above, and further in view of Gonzalez et al (US Pub: 2005/0012749).

As for claim 6, see discussion of claim 1 above, this claim differs from claim 1 only in that the phrase "video privacy logic" recited in claim is substituted by the phrase "a video driver". Wooten and Sato does not explicitly teach a video

driver within the computing device. Gonzalez teaches a video driver (i.e. video driver 210, 212) within the computing device (i.e. the computer where the computer application 200 is run) (see Fig. 2, [0039])

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the design of placing video driver in the computer device in the over all privacy display system of Wooten and Sato in order to allow the combination the processing power of multiple video card and utilize multiple graphics processor more efficiently. (see Gonzalez [0020]).

As for claim 7, see discussion of claims 2 and 6, claim 7 is rejected on the same ground as claim 2 when in view of claim 6 which it is depended upon.

As for claim 8, see discussion of claims 3 and 6, claim 8 is rejected on the same ground as claim 2 when in view of claim 6 which it is depended upon.

As for claim 9, see discussion of claims 4 and 6, claim 9 is rejected on the same ground as claim 4 when in view of claim 6 which it is depended upon.

As for claim 10, see discussion of claims 5 and 6, claim 10 is rejected on the same ground as claim 5 when in view of claim 6 which it is depended upon.

As for claim 11, see discussion of claim 6 above, Wooten and Gonzales teaches the system of claim 6, Wooten teaches the first port is a video port (i.e. the first port is the connection for the primary display that does not afford private viewing which will be video capable since the private eyewear display replacing it has the video input signal, therefore the first port must be a video port) and the second port is an auxiliary port (i.e. the private eyewear display is a peripheral device, by definition auxiliary in nature) (see Wooten [0019]).

As for claim 33, see discussion of claim 1 above, Wooten teaches the system of claim 1, but does not explicitly teach a graphics memory control hub in the computing device. Gonzalez teaches a graphic memory control hub (226) in the computing device (i.e. the video merger hub 226 in able to output to a CRT display, a liquid crystal display, a heads up display or any hybrid thereof) (see Fig. 2, [0023], [0039]). Therefore the combination of the Gonzalez design with the overall system of Wooten would meet the limitation.

6. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wooten in view of Sato further in view of Gonzalez as applied to claims 6-11 and 33 above, and further in view of Love et al. (US Pub: 2004/0201544) .

As for claim 32, see discussion of claim 12 above, Wooten, Sato and Gonzalez teaches the method of claim 12, wherein the HID is a first HID, and the port is a first port; further comprising sending signal to a video driver of the computing device to start sending video data to the first HID. But does not explicitly teach a second HID. Love teaches a second HID (806(2)) (i.e. Multi-Display Output Divider 102 output to both head-mounted display device 806(1) and 806(2)) (see Fig. 8, [0061], [0062]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the design multiple port for plugging in multiple HID unit simultaneous in addition to the video driver design of Wooten, Sato and Gonzalez in order to allow multiple user to access the video signal simultaneously. (see Love [0004])

7. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wooten in view of Sato further in view of Gonzalez as applied to claims 6-11 and 33 above, and further in view of Stubbs et al. (US Patent: 6,736,759).

As to claim 36 Wooten, Sato and Gonzalez teaches the system of claim 11, but does not explicitly wherein the auxiliary port is a USB port. Stubbs teaches wherein the auxiliary port is a USB port (i.e. the heads up display is connected to the computer via a USB port) (see Fig. 19, Col. 10, Lines 56-61, Col. 21, Lines 30-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the USB port design of Stubbs for the auxiliary port connecting the privacy display system of Wooten in order to adapt the privacy device to work with a to given PC which have USB port. (see Stubbs, Col. 10, Lines 48-56)

8. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wooten in view of Sato further in view of Gonzalez and further in view of Stubbs as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Sharma et al. (US Patent: 5,829,016).

As to claim 37 Wooten, Sato, Gonzalez and Stubbs teaches the system of claim 36, but does not explicitly teach wherein the logic supports data coherency between the HID and the computing device via 'snooping' and performing address translation for access to memory contained within the computer device.

Sharma teaches the computing device (i.e. the CPU 101 of the computer) via 'snooping' and performing address translation for access to memory contained within the computer device (107) (see Fig. 1, Col. 4, Lines 55-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the data caching design of Sharma with the privacy display system of Wooten in order to allow a less complex timing scheme for the computer memory design. (see Sharma, Col. 2, Lines 19-30)

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 12-14, 16, 18-25, 27, 29, 30-31 and 34-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In view of amendment, the reference Sato has been added for new grounds.

Regarding applicants argument with respect to claim 1, in page 10 paragraph 2, that the cited reference does not disclose or teach enabling the primary display device when the privacy device is uncoupled from the port of the computing device, the examiner disagree, because Wooten teaches a auto-blanking system, blanking is by definition a temporary state where the device after plugging in to the computer assures that the main display is stopped. Therefore when the device uncoupled and is removed the blanking is disabled and the main display is no longer blanked.

Regarding applicants argument with respect to claim 16, in page 10 paragraph 3, that the prior art does not teach monitoring weather the privacy device continues to be couple to the port, the examiner disagrees because the personal computer as taught by Wooten has embedded software that controls its own ports, and since the auto-blanking function refers to the ability to stop the data flow to one port and redirecting it to the device it requires that the computer operating system being able to detect that the device is currently connected and blanking of main display is need. This is a form of active monitoring of signals from the input port.

Regarding applicants argument with respect to claim 31, in page 10 paragraph 4, that the prior art does not teach prompting the user with the primary display device, the examiner disagrees because the personal computer as taught by Wooten the user specifically attach the auto-blanking system to the port of the computer and also allow the user to apply control with the built-in navigation system. This action is equivalent to allowing the user to take control of the computer and activate or deactivate the computer software running at the prompt of the user.

Regarding applicants argument with respect to claim 17, in page 11 paragraph 3, that the prior art does not teach start sending video data to the primary display and stop sending splash screen data, the examiner disagrees because the personal computer as taught by Wooten has embedded software that controls its own ports, when the auto-blanking function is deactivated the operation return to un-blanked state as the software driven system works

automatically, this means that in combination with Eck's teaching the splash screen data is to be replaced as the user must be allow to return to previous state, other wise the system would not be able to function as an auto-blanking system.

Regarding applicants argument with respect to claim 32, in page 11 paragraph 6, that the prior art does not teach detecting coupling of a second HID to a second port of the computer device, the examiner disagrees because the personal computer as taught by Wooten has embedded software that controls its own ports, it is known by one skill in the art that more than one ports in the computer can be used as most computer requires multiple peripheral devices to operate such as keyboard, mouse, monitor, and printer. Therefore in combination with Love's multiple display system the auto blanking goggle system would be able to function with the computer to allow multiple users having the goggle to view the display.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CALVIN C. MA whose telephone number is (571)270-1713. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-7772. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Chanh Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

Calvin Ma
March 27, 2008